

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the preceding amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

No claims having been added or canceled, the Applicant submits that claims 1-3 and 5-60 remain pending and properly under consideration in this application.

Objections to the Claims

The Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that the amendments provided in the Applicant's Response of December 1, 2006, were sufficient to overcome the noted objections.

Interview Summary

The Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's grant of and participation in the personal interview on June 22, 2007, with the Applicant, Thomas Brandenborg, and the Applicant's representative, Greg Brummett. No exhibits were shown and no demonstrations were conducted during the interview. The only reference discussed during the interview was the Examiner's primary reference, Chiu, particularly with regard to the Applicant's characterization of this reference as an asset management system ("AMS") that does not teach or suggest the additional functionality of the system as disclosed in the present application. The Applicant also presented additional explanation regarding the purpose and utility of the inventions disclosed in

the present application, particularly with respect to the functions related to the operation of such a system in a news room environment. The Applicants appreciate the Examiner's comments and suggestions with regard to incorporating additional disclosure into the pending claims for the purpose of addressing perceived ambiguity with respect to certain of the claim terms.

Priority

The Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's acknowledgement of the Applicant's claim for foreign priority and the filing of the priority document in the parent application. Action at 2.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 1-2, 5-11 and 13-60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,181,336 to Chiu et al. ("Chiu"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection in view of the following argumentation.

As explained during the personal interview, the Applicant contends that Chiu is an asset management system ("AMS"), sometimes referred as a database management system ("DBMS") that allows for the storing, tracking and linking a variety of files that can, in turn, be accessed by external applications for the creation of multimedia products. The Applicant maintains, however, that Chiu does not teach or suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art the additional functions by which the recited "planning and coordinating of usage of PCOs in one or more publications" by "maintaining relations between anticipated news stories and said publications"

as recited in claim 1. In particular, the Applicant maintains that Chiu does not provide or maintain relationships between the content of the database and any particular publication.

The Applicant, therefore, request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn accordingly.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiu in view of Nasr et al.’s U.S. Patent 6,263,332 (“Nasr”). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection in view of the following argumentation.

The Applicant respectfully incorporates the arguments above regarding the deficiencies of Chiu with respect to claim 1 and contends that Nasr does not remedy these deficiencies. Accordingly, the Applicant maintains that claim 3 is allowable over the proposed combination of references for the reasons detailed above with respect to claim 1.

The Applicant, therefore, request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn accordingly.

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiu in view of Milstead et al.’s U.S. Patent 6,345,256 (“Milstead”). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection in view of the following argumentation.

The Applicant respectfully incorporates the arguments above regarding the deficiencies of Chiu with respect to claim 1 and contends that Milstead does not remedy these deficiencies.

Accordingly, the Applicant maintains that claim 12 is allowable over the proposed combination of references for the reasons detailed above with respect to claim 1.

The Applicant, therefore, request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn accordingly.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of claims 1-3 and 5-60 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant(s) hereby petition(s) for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a reply to the outstanding Office Action and submit the required \$120 extension fee herewith.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact John A. Castellano at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

~~HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.~~

By

John A. Castellano, Reg. No. 35,094

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

JAC/GPB